Dear Court:

I have been moving about this summer, going as far as Honolulu (where your highly desirable letter reached me after several stopping places by the way.) and now I am in California with a day or two of my vacation left before starting East.

Your letter was the first bit of news I had beyond newspaper stuff of the effects of the G. A.'s action. It wrought mightily upon me. For several days I was in a belligerent mood — mad all over and through & through. I would have enjoyed nothing better than visiting a penalty like a slap ~~on~~ that ~~mouth~~ which you invited so winsomely in ~~that~~ the figure of the mistletoed cocktail.

Beware the "unco guid", Robbie! They have more mean varieties of wickedness than a plain, honest devil would ever think of perpetrating. A decent devil would never be disloyal to a friend. It takes a picture-show saint to do that.

You didn't see that incident

in the Assembly at Tulsa when the prairie gentleman, finding it indiscreet and very much against his interest to respond to the clamor for his personal opinion, bowed his head in the presence of all — an effectively dramatic gesture to all who do not know that "the heart of man is deceitful above all things & desperately wicked" and for that reason, if for no other, there was that prairie pose to spare.

I see his ambition for his son has been running out of bounds too — shelving Will Moody to the dismay of the Northfield faithfuls.

What do you know about the new venture of Machen et al.? Is there a chance for it's being a "go"?

Might pleasant to have had this word and let me "gnash my teeth" for friendship's sake.

Let me hear again when the spirit moves,

Faithfully,

Bob

September 7. 1929

Yours & mine,

P.S. Jack had a knock out blow this summer similar to x
He is recovering slowly.

Aug. 2
1929

THE NASSAU CLUB
PRINCETON, N.J.

Dear Dr. Robinson:—

It warmed the cockles of my heart to hear from you again after so long a time. Much water has gone under the bridge since we last met. The situation is mixed & perplexing, but not without hope. What you have read in the papers gives all the news I have regarding the new Seminary.

Of course I see the prime movers and talk matters over with them. If men like Hodge & Armstrong had decided to "walk out" as did Wilson, Machen, Allis & Van Til there would have been more momentum to the movement. But, as it is, there are many encouragements.

As to Maitland, your suggestion is good, and we may be sure that nothing will be left undone by his friends to bring him into

line financially. In fact he has already intimated his readiness to supply the sinews of war. I would be glad to see a Seminary bearing his name as the chief benefactor.

I am here looking after pastoral work in the absence of pastors. So far I have not identified myself actively with the new Seminary, for my residence in California makes a wide gulf between me and the scene of action.

Whatever the protestations of the new Board, I am sadly sure that, constituted as it is, liberal policies will prevail more & more until the old land marks will remain only in the buildings and name. It is all a distressing debacle.

With love and best wishes, my dear friend

Most sincerely Yours

Sylvester W. Beach.

Thursday, Sept. 19th/29 Delancey, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Robinson:-

I was in Poughkeepsie yesterday and had a talk with Rev. Earl Douglass of the 1st Pres. Church with respect to Rev Murry Hunter, the young Scotchman who was formerly Mr. Douglass' assistant and who has just returned to N.Y. from Australia, where he went a year ago to marry his best girl. Mr. Douglass recommends Mr. Hunter very highly. The latter is now considering a position at Stamford, Conn, as director of Religious Education. But would much prefer to become pastor of a Church, now that he has a wife. He were wondering if they would care to give him a hearing at Margurettville + Pine Hill where Mr. Walker is leaving. He would like to look over the field anyhow. I know nothing of that charge (Margurettville + Pinehill) - How much salary they pay - if there is a parsonage + the prospects for development. Mr. Douglass wanted me to ask you about these matters. Hunter is sound theologically so Douglass says and since Mr. Douglass, was brought up a U.P. + leans toward the Conservative side, I thought that point might be safely taken for granted. I was wondering if I could see you up at Merrill's drug store tomorrow Eve or afternoon + talk it over so that I could phone Mr. D. Fri Eve or Sat. Mr. Hunter is to preach for Dr Douglass next Sat. Eve. Could you let me know by phone when I could see you. Yours Truly, Wm M. Barr

Box 65, ~~1929~~
Castine, Maine,
July 25, 1929

Dear Robinson:-

Yours of July 13th to hand. I was out of town when it arrived, hence some delay in replying.

You have doubtless already seen the N Y Times with account of the new Seminary. I received from Beach yesterday a letter bringing me up to date with progress. The last meeting was held in Phila. last Thursday; 75 present two-thirds of them elders; sentiment for new Sem. now, unanimous; $22,000. for first year expenses pledged; several locations mentioned but new parish house of Tioga Ptes. Ch., Phila., the most likely place; several adequate rooms fully equipped free of rent offered; new houses single and apartments near the church for profs. and students; Wilson, Allis, Machen, Van Til available now, Army will not leave Princeton, and Hodge is hesitating; prospect for students good, probably 50, with perhaps 40 coming from Princeton Sem.; the thing has enough momemtum now to go through for September; another meeting called for Thursday July 25th in Phila.; why do you not attend it? They would welcome you. Write to Beach, Nassau Club, Princeton for hour and place. I would certainly be there were I not so far away. (My brains are not awake yet--this is the day. How could you get there!)

Now as to how I feel about all this. I have thought the matter over carefully and I am with the new movement. I hope you will be also. I cannot hope that Princeton will remain true to historic Calvinism. We know that Stevenson wants an inclusive Seminary; that he favors union with all sorts of churches; which means, of course, that doctrinal differences are not matters of chief importance to him. We know that Finney, one of the most influential and outspoken men on the Board, is quite indifferent to doctrine, considers it more of a nuisance and dead-weight than anything else; and we know that Speer is outspoken in behalf of a thorughgoing reorganization and reconstruction of the Seminary. He is completly for union and inclusiveness. Now with these strong men feeling as they do, and with their record of opposition to the old Princeton and the Board who stood for it, what can we expect except a change of policy? Concessions are bound to be made, and drift away will inevitably begin. I do not think they will go far, but ~~they~~ it will be a colorless, neutral, passive sort of Seminary with the old brave fighting spirit vanished. They will not be feared by the modernists, sceptics, atheists, as the old Princeton was.

In view of the above, and in view of the necessity of keeping that brave old spirit of historic Calvinism alive in these days, I think it is my duty to be true to my convictions and to do what I can to keep that light burning. I hope you feel this way about it and I would like to hear your views.

I would not send the letter to Speer. What good will it do? He has a right to his opinion, and we knew all along that he favored the Thompson report, and I did not think he could put much heart into advocating the Group report before the Assembly when so many of the Directors advocated another plan. I am quite sure the division would have taken the snap out of me if it had been my job to further the Group cause. Do not write the letter. And let Speer alone. He is all right. Only we differ on a matter of judgment and policy. We do not have to follow him, and we will not follow him in all respects, but I for one am glad to follow him in other respects.

I think you are absolutely right in thinking that the Group report would have carried the Assembly if the Minority had not put forth their plan and divided our forces. But the minority men think we are to blame. Inglis attacked me in a public meeting on that score. Now what is the good

of recriminations like that? He can no more truthfully say that we caused the disaster than we can say that his crowd caused it, because neither of us know whether our statements are true. It is just conjecture and opinion.

Like you I am a little surprised at Macartney, (especially), McEwan and Hutchison for remaining on the new Board. I could not have done it. But that is their business and I am not disposed to criticise them. They will have a good influence in keeping Princeton from drifting too fast. I wish they would come with us in the new Seminary. If some of the more strenuous brethren would forget the past and urge them to come perhaps they would. I am going to work to that end. Hutchison is to spend August here and I am going to sound him out on this matter. He might be willing to change over if he were welcomed and made to feel that he had not lost his soul eternally because he voted for the compromise, "deserted" as the minority like to say, which is just nonsense.

Perhaps you feel that you are not welcome? I have felt that a little. And I waited until Beach invited me to the first meeting in New York. I went and expressed myself, and I have secured some money for the new school. If you feel you would like to be on the new Board write to Beach and tell him you are in sympathy. The more we have the better. In onions there is strength, as the old lady got it.

Trusting you are having a good vacation,

Yours cordially,

Rockwell Brank

Central Presbyterian Church
Summit, New Jersey

Minister
Rockwell S. Brank
52 Maple Street

February 18, 1929

Dear Dr Robinson:-

I am taking the liberty of enclosing herewith a carbon copy of a letter I am writing to Dr McEwan. Pardon it, please, but I am rushed for time, and I have not the opportunity to write out another letter. And please excuse the many mistakes my one-finger artistry has made.

On Saturday, when I first read Craig's Supplement, I felt very badly and very uncomfortable, and, as you occupy eaxctly the position I hold, I was going to write you then and ask whether you feel uncomfortable and out of place on the Group. I have read the Supplement again this morning and do not feel so badly, but in order to be true to our ~~group~~ friends on the faculty I think we on the Group who have stood with them, must guard carefully against giving the president any more power over them. It is bad enough for them to have to go on with the head from whose administration they dissent, but to have him come back from the fray with added powers over them, and those powers recommended by their friends, would be adding insult to injury. If we can safeguard this point I shall feel more comfortable on the Group.

Yours cordially,

Rockwell Brank

Delhi, N. Y.
May 29, 1929

Rev. Rockwell S. Brank, D. D.
52 Maple St.
Summit, N. J.

My dear Brank:

Yours is just at hand and also New York Times containing list of new Board. My ecclesiastical life has brought me no greater sorrow than this. To think that seven years ago Ross Stevenson without a friend except Speer in the Board of Directors with Erdman and Loetscher condemning vehemently, broken in heart enough to make me his confidential should come off victor covered with spangles! It is a miracle. If it be of the Lord we must bow in humble submission. If it is due to machination and treachery of men time will declare it.

When I last saw Laird he told me he would be on the new Board with McEwan, MMacartney, Morgan, Hutchinson, Mudge, Speer and Willison Smith. He had seen a list and I find his prediction was accurate. He was very lukewarm about Majority Report which you and I, poor dupes, took in good faith. My suspicion will not down that Speer and Mudge never wished it to have a show. However, that is past. A very able young lady here deeply interested said, "Post-mortems are unpleasant and profitless."

Personally I am hurt and grieved. Stone put me off the Board of Publication and now Stevenson and Speer put me off the one Board which I enjoyed until lately. Some profit in it. I am convinced that a village pastor has no place in our church and secondly that I have not wit enough to associate with that crowd.

As to law suit I think it will be started. I have no money to help. I would be of aid in no other way. With Macartney on the new Board another Seminary will not be started. He alone commands money in any amount. To return to the law suit I have gave doubts as to its success. I notice Lanning is one new Board. Princeton which you and I have loved is gone. With its departure we have Stone, Speer, Erdman, Stevenson ruling the church in every part. And the oncoming flock of lady elders and ministers. Possibly I am behind the times. I well know that I am out of accord with the present temper of the church, especially as to union as expressed by McAfee.

The tide will turn some time but I will not live to see it. I have given 38 years continuously as pastor, I have never sought place and have declined salaries larger than I ever received. I am sorry to have my last years my sad years. I regret to have my confidence in men I have loved shaken. I am deep in the blues.

Write again, dear fellow, perhaps we can get some comfort talking plainly to one another.

As to new Board it is pleasant that McDowell and Bruce are not on it. To drop Warfield was a crime. He has been abused. Speer told me

last September in my home that he would not serve. I am wondering if Macartney will serve. Mudge declined a year ago but now yields to pressure. I am sorry for Crane. He has suffered much. Emmons is not a pleasant sight but money rules.

I have expressed myself freely. My trust in the Lord is not shaken but His ways are sometimes hard on us. To His name be glory. I speak in reverence and sincerity.

Yours most sincerely,

WCR:MAL

Delhi, N. Y.
February 20, 1929

Rev. Rockwell S. Brank, D.D.
52 Maple St.
Summit, N. J.

Dear Dr. Brank:

Thank you for your letter enclosing a copy of one sent to Dr. McEwan. You and I seem to be very alike in spirit and ideas and in some points are separate from other members of the Board.

Certainly, we have no desire to increase the prestige or authority of the President so long as the present incumbent is there. His inept, often evasive methods have brought on our present troubles. Your suggestions relative to Art. V., Sec. 4 and 5 appeal to my judgment. As to the matter of removal I wish the Board had possessed it without reference to the G. A. in 1924. There would have been no Princeton trouble. At that time even Dr. Erdman would have approved for he gave me the most damaging opinion of Dr. Stevenson that has come to my ears from anyone. If G. A. approval is necessary nobody who will put up a fight can ever be removed for our G. A. is a sob-sister body and any voice with tinge of martyrdom which he is small enough to exploit can save himself. Had Machen gone on the platform of Baltimore Assembly and uttered a few sobs, shed a few tears, cried about tolerance even he could have saved himself. I am glad he is not that sort. No, let the Board, restrained by the amendment, "two-thirds of members present", have power to fire. That lack has been our weakness.

Craig is a fine, able man. In my heart I am with him. Could I convince myself that his paper had a ghost of a chance with G.A. I would stick with him to the uttermost. But in my opinion his paper has no chance. After all our effort last year we gained not a victory as Craig and Crane aver, but a chance to try again. I am glad to have Craig send his paper as minority report for if by some chance the Assembly should happen to prefer it they could take it. We are to compose differences. Suppose we endorse Craig's paper by close vote and suppose the Assembly should adopt it retaining two Boards, do you think the Trustees would not make trouble at every step? The only way to prevent a constant clash between Directors and Trustees henceforth would be to remove W. P. W. P. Stevenson (gentle, pleasant soul), McDowell, Emmons,

R.S.B. 2/20/29

Robson, Jennings, Dixon and one more, which you know the Assembly will never do. You are right, when two Boards are made one with present personnel you will find at least 19 Directors and 6 or 7 Trustees sticking together.

I feel perfectly comfortable on the group because in all good faith I voted to make overture to Trustees, (the deciding voter); when they turned it down I voted for Craig's report which Directors refused and now I will try to unite both Boards whether Trustees consent or not, as the one way to prevent a Thompson picked Board of 33. My trouble in the group comes from another source which I hope you will keep in strict confidence. How far can we trust Spear and Mudge? They are able, very powerful and shrewd. I do not like Speer's part in kicking Moody out to give his exceedingly liberal son a high place. I do not like Speer, Mudge and Stevenson joining liberals to force a Presbyterian-Methodist union. Stone of Chicago, Speer, Mudge, Stevenson, Erdman with a few lesser ones are the "machine" which runs the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. today. No man can get on any Board or in any important position without their approval. Now are Speer and Mudge turning from Thompson report, which they confessedly prefer in good faith or do they see something we do not see? As to their personal orthodoxy I have no question but they breathe a different atmosphere than I do and know church politics through and through and are not hesitant about furthering their ideas and the men of their choice. I wish to hold no unjust suspicion but it lurks with me. Their prompt acquiescence in our further amendments to the plan caused it to increase. Laird and McEwan have no such suspicion and I hope I am all wrong in mine. It would be so much easier if I did not have it. I do not harbor it nor cherish it but it abides. This is between us.

If they are working out this consolidation sincerely, they have certainly done a lot of work, it is the best plan in sight to safe-guard Princeton as we want it, and if they work it sincerely it will carry overwhelmingly.

Just one thing more. Every Erdman-Stevenson desire and device finds utterances in Finney, Speer and others. Every Machen-Wilson device and desire finds utterance in Craig, Crane and others. Now we must rise above Faculty divisions and act as judgment dictates no matter what President or Professors think. They have no business to "butt in". Their intrusion made the rumpus. I belong neither to Machen or Stevenson though in position I stand with Machen. Finney on one side, Craig on the other are simply echoes. Craig will not be as big a man as I think he is if he withdraws even though defeated.

Princeton is bound to be revised. Perhaps it needed it. I want to do what I can to prevent either Machen or Stevenson from gaining such a victory as to have full control. We Directors cannot entirely disprove the accusation that we did not direct. At

R.S.B. 2/20/29

the first sign of trouble when the Committee of Seven investigated we should not have accepted their mushy report but rather have taken somebody by the neck and shaken him. But mistakes are too numerous to be reviewed. Our part is to "compose" as God gives us light and courage.

Cordially yours,

WCR:MAL

Central Presbyterian Church
Summit, New Jersey

Minister
Rockwell S. Brank
52 Maple Street

May 28, 1929

Dear Dr Robinson:-

Of course you saw in this morning's paper that the Assembly yesterday adopted the Thompson report. The worst has happened. Now I think that action releases you and me from any further obligation to the Majority Report, and the question arises, What next?

I presume some of the Minority men will take the matter into the Courts as they have threatened. Shall we join them in that action? Or would it be better to refrain from that and to work for a new Seminary. I would prefer the latter provided the new institution should be absolutely free from General Assembly control.

How do you feel on this and all kindred subjects.

Trusting you are well, and no deeper in the depths than I am,

Yours cordially,

RSB.

Central Presbyterian Church
Summit, New Jersey

Minister
Rockwell S. Brank
52 Maple Street

May 11, 1929

Dear Robinson:-

Yours of yesterday arrived this morning. Recent actions and reactions are a bit disconcerting, I must say, and I cannot blame you for being discouraged and disgusted, but hold on to the Majority report. Pressure is being brought to bear on me to change over to the Minority. Reid Dickson is getting shaky, and Burt Crane has written me a letter advising me to change. But I am going to stand by the Majority (or Minority is it now) report.

In the first place I voted for it not at all on the hope that the Trustees might join with us. That Board's actions interest me very little. I voted for it because whether one or two boards govern the Seminary, to my mind, is quite a secondary matter, being simply a question of form of administration; because it retained the men who had stood for the historic position of the Seminary whereas the Thompson report dropped them (this is really the great difference between the two, Craig to the contarry notwithstanding); and because, under present circumstances, it appeared to me to have a better chance of beating the wrteched Thompson report than the Minority report had, or has, even now with all sorts of rumors of defections and changes of mind.

I think Crane's charge that the Majority report is "wicked" is wrong. A compromise is not inherently wrong, but becomes so only when its motives and objectives are wrong. That report is a frank, honest compromise, in which both sides yielded something for the good purpose of bringing warring elements together and of carrying on the work of the Seminary. If it is defeated by the Minority report I shall be very happy to get what I have all along wanted; if it is defeated by the Thompson report I shall still have the satisfaction of having made an honorable effort to carry out the order of the Assembly to compose differences and to bring the factions together.

I feel quite comfortable standing on the Majority report. I have had many a sad hour thinking over the stubbornness of some on the Minority side, and I really feel happier in the present position than for some time. My conscience feels better. It seems to be nearer that truth-seasoned-with-love position which Christ seems to advocate and which is so very difficult to attain at times, and which has been especially difficult to attin in the Princeton mess.

Let us stand by the Majority report.

I think it would be better simply to refuse to believe the story about Mudge. Neither he nor anyone else so far as I know has withdrawn his name from the Majority report. There the signatures stand in the Blue Book, and until they are withdrawn they may be all counted as for the report. If some of the signers affix their names to other reports, as Laird is reported in todays Times to have joined the Trustees in favoring the Thompson report "with reservations", those men doubtless have satisfied their own minds that they are not acting inconsistently, and they will have to make that clear to their friends. But until they take their names away from our report let us insist on counting them.

As you say a good deal depends on Speer's advocacy of the Majority report at the Assembly, but if he puts his usual punch into it it will very likely win. And it is the kind of thing for which he likes to stand because it has real merit and is both a Christian and common sense effort to solve the problem. But whether he goes at it earnestly or not, and whether it wins or loses, I still think it is the best offer ofthe three.

After all is said and done, Princeton Seminary belongs more to the Lord than to any of us, and this is a time, if ever there was a time, for not being discouraged, but for taking it to the Lord in prayer. Faith is the root of peace of mind. And I still believe that God is able to do what He wills with Princeton. Perhaps Princeton needs a real soaking bath. Some things and some,persons are a little seedy down there, and a new day might be good for us all. If the Trustees and Dr Stevenson win out and I am thrown out, as I would certainly expect to be, I shall be rather glad of the release. Indeed, if they win I should resign because I would not be a party to their changes and would not serve with my friends left out.

These are stormy days, but they test whether we are good sailors and good steersmen or bad ones.

Yours cordially,

Rockwell Brank

CHERRY-BURRELL CORPORATION

COMPLETE EQUIPMENT FOR HANDLING MILK
AND ITS PRODUCTS

FROM THE OFFICE OF
LOOMIS BURRELL
CHAIRMAN OF BOARD

LITTLE FALLS,
NEW YORK

July 11,1929

Dr. W. Courtland Robinson,
Delhi, N. Y.

Dear Dr. Robinson:

Your very kind letter of July 10th telling us about Rev. Joseph Andersen Schofield, Hobart, N. Y. has been received, and I sincerely thank you for taking the trouble you have in writing to me.

I am passing your letter on to Mr. Gordon D. Little, who is Chairman of the Committee to recommend a new Pastor.

Our present Pastor, Mr. Riggs, resignation does not take effect until September 1st but he has agreed to preach through September.

I remember your preaching in Little Falls and how happy we were always to have you here.

I hope you are well and that I may sometime have the pleasure again of a visit with you.

Again thanking you for your kindness, I am,
Sincerely yours,

L/s

Loomis Burrell

121 Rutgers Ave,
Swarthmore, Pa.
April 21, 1929.

Dear Dr. Robinson,

Mother wishes me to express our sincere thanks for your kind letter carrying the sympathy which this family so much needs. Friends are of the greatest help in a time such as this.

Thanking you for your letter and speaking for the whole family, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Talbot Bronson

GRACE DODGE HOTEL
WASHINGTON, D.C.

April 9, 1929

My dear Dr. Robinson:

I have written Westchester and shall hope to have their reply soon. I have also dropped John Lyon a line asking if he will take the pulpit that Sunday. I understand Mr. McIntosh for the Church has also asked him for the 14th. If he can do both it will be very fine, and I hope does not impose. The Church would pay him the first Sunday and I the second.

Mr. Wyer called me in to his office after I had left you Friday and he had a letter from a newspaper man in Westchester about me.

Very sincerely,

F. C. Boothout.

822 S. 48th St.,
Philadelphia.

Dear Dr. Robinson,-

Your letter of sympathy has certainly been of great comfort. Edna and Earle join me in thanking you for it. Of course we miss Aunt Alice more than any one, for she has been like a mother to us for a good many years, but we know she is far happier

where she is than she ever could be here. She has been so lonely since Uncle Cal left us, and now they are united with each other and with all our other loved ones. Then, too, the doctor said that even if she had gotten better, she would never have been real well and strong - would not have been able to be as active as she always has been, and you know she would have been most unhappy and discontented.

It was not really another attack with her heart such as she had a number of years ago, although of course her heart has never been just what it was before. She was suffering with high blood pressure for several weeks, but the doctor had not put her to bed. On November 22nd she was over at Northminster at a little missionary entertainment, but was not like herself at all. The next day the doctor kept her on the couch all day, and Saturday she was not able to get up at all. We got a trained nurse for her, but she was not getting the rest and quiet she needed, so on Monday we took her to the hospital. At first she stayed about the same, but beginning with the following Sunday she just steadily grew weaker until Friday night when she just breathed away at 11.30. We are so thankful she did not suffer.

Earle is leaving for a position in Washington, D.C., so I am afraid it's going to be very lonely here without any of my family in the city.

Thank you again for your comforting letter and kindly words.

Most sincerely yours,

Jan. 4, 1929. Madeleine Brown.

FRANCIS C. BROWN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
1120 BALFOUR BUILDING
SAN FRANCISCO
DAVENPORT 4800

AIR MAIL

December 31, 1928

Reverend Courtland Robinson,
First Presbyterian Church,
Delhi, New York.

Dear Sir:

I am attorney for James Douglas Pritchard and his three brothers, Paul, Edward and Lyle, who are charged in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, with having in their possession a number of counterfeit raised federal reserve notes with the fraudulent intention of passing them and uttering the same.

A plea of guilty has been entered by the defendants and a motion made for probation. These young men inform me that they were members of your church during the time they lived near Delhi. From my personal investigation of the case I believe that their motion for probation should be passed upon favorably and that they should be given another opportunity to lead honest lives. If you are willing to make a recommendation in their behalf please write one to me immediately stating therein the length of time that you knew them and any information you may have as to their ages.

Unless this information is received within the next ten days it will be too late for consideration.

Very truly yours,

Francis C. Brown

FCB:CC

Francis C. Brown